DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 689 JC 760 568

TITLE	Minority Awareness: Programming for Success. Proceedings of (the) 2nd Annual Staff Development Workshop, Morganton, North Carolina, April 27-28, 1976.
INSTITUTION	Western North Carolina Consortium, Inc.
SPONS AGENCY	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga. Inst. for Higher Educational Opportunity.
NOTE	42p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N. W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; Community Colleges; Ethnic Groups; *Junior Colleges; *Minority Groups; Program Planning; Psychological Characteristics; Socioeconomic Influences; Staff Improvement; *Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; *Student Needs; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This document compiles the addresses presented at the 2nd Annual Staff Development Workshop sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity. The objectives of the workshop emphasized the need for awareness of and about minority students among those responsible for educational opportunities and the eventual academic success of minority students. John W. Lavery reviews the Responsibilities of a Public Two-Year College in Meeting the Needs of Minority Students. Revonda Williams discusses Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Minority Students. Janice Kennedy discusses the Psychological Factors Affecting Minority Students. Charles E. Grigsby presents criteria for Institutional Programming to Meet the Needs of the Minority Student. An evaluation of the conference by its participants is included as is a list of attendees and a listing of members and staff of the Western North Carolina Consortium. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130689

Proceedings of

2nd ANNUAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Western Piedmont Community College

Morganton, N. C.

April 27-28, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MINORITY AWARENESS:

Programming For Success

Sponsored by

Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Western North Carolina Consortium

$1.00

Jc 760 568

FOREWORD

Upon requests from educators and colleges and universities throughout the region, the Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity has sponsored many conferences and workshops to assist institutions of higher education in meeting the needs of minority students. The workshop reported in the following pages emphasizes the need for and value of staff development as another means by which institutions may expand opportunities for minority students and also assure greater quality in the delivery of educational services.

The theme of the workshop, "Minority Awareness--Programming for Success," was most appropriate in that this was the first multi-institution conference directed to minority students to be conducted in western North Carolina.

This fact and the deep concern for the minority student expressed by the Western North Carolina Consortium in correspondence and during meetings with its representatives appeared to be excellent reasons for the Institute and the Consortium to sponsor the workshop.

The objectives of the workshop emphasized the need for awareness among those responsible for educational opportunities and the eventual academic success of minority students in the geographical areas represented by the colleges:

1. To assist each institution's workshop team in gaining an understanding of the environment of their minority students.

2. To identify the educational needs of the minority students.

3. To explore those needs and to discuss the implications for the structure, policies and educational services of the colleges.

4. To define the roles of the college staff in meeting the needs of the minority students.

We hope that this report will be of useful service to the members of the Consortium and to other interested institutions.

July 1, 1976

S. E. Cary
Associate Director for Programs
Institute for Higher
Educational Opportunity
Southern Regional Education Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iii
Table of Contents	v
Program	vii
Workshop Evaluation	xi
Presentations	
"The Responsibilities of a Public Two-Year Institution in Meeting the Needs of Minority Students"	1
"Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Minority Students"	9
"Psychological Factors Affecting Minority Students"	15
"Instructional Programming to Meet the Needs of the Minority Student"	21
Workshop Participants	29
The Western Carolina Consortium	32
Acknowledgements	33

PROGRAM

Minority Awareness--Programming for Success

A Workshop on Staff Development in Community Colleges

Western Piedmont Community College
Morganton, North Carolina

April 27-28, 1976

Tuesday Morning, April 27

9:00 - 10:00	Registration - Lobby - Western Piedmont Community College	
10:00 - 11:15	Auditorium	
	Welcome	Dr. Gordon C. Blank, President Western Piedmont Community College
	The Program of the Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity	Mr. S. E. Cary Associate Director for Programs Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity Southern Regional Education Board
	Program Introduction	Dr. William R. Richardson
	Session I. "Responsibilities of a Public Two-Year Institution in Meeting the Needs of Minority Students"	
	Moderator:	Ms. Beverly Hawkins
	Recorder:	Mr. Carl Moore
	Speaker:	Dr. John W. Lavery, President John Tyler Community College Chester, Virginia
11:30 - 12:15	Discussion - Session I	
	Group A Auditorium	Moderator: Dr. Phillip Lewis Consultant: Dr. John W. Lavery
	Group B E-111	Moderator: Dr. Leland Cooper Consultant: Ms. Revonda Williams

	Group C B-115	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. Paul Apple Dr. Janice Kennedy
	Group D A-13	Moderator: Consultant:	Dr. Hazel Small Mr. Charles E. Grigsby

Tuesday Afternoon

2:00 - 3:00 Session II "Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Minority Students"
Auditorium

Moderator: Ms. Joanne Johnston

Recorder: Ms. Sybil Reed

Speaker: Ms. Revonda Williams
Mountain Empire Community College
Big Stone Gap, Virginia

3:00 - 3:15 Break

3:15 - 4:00 Discussion - Session II

Group A E-111	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. James Turner Mr. Charles E. Grigsby
Group B Auditorium	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. John Keen Dr. John W. Lavery
Group C E-109	Moderator: Consultant:	Dr. William R. Richardson Ms. Revonda Williams
Group D A-15	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. Kenneth Garrett Dr. Janice Kennedy

Wednesday Morning, April 28

9:30 - 10:30 Session III "Psychological Factors Affecting Minority Students"
Auditorium

Moderator: Dr. Lawrence Arney

Recorder: Dr. Hazel Small

Speaker: Dr. Janice Kennedy
Assistant to the President
Bishop State Community College
Mobile, Alabama

10:30 - 10:50 Break

10:50 - 11:45 Discussion - Session III

Group A E-110	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. Carlos Surratt Dr. Janice Kennedy
Group B E-111	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. Carl Moore Mr. Charles E. Grigsby
Group C Auditorium	Moderator: Consultant:	Ms. Beverly Hawkins Dr. John W. Lavery
Group D Library Conf. Room	Moderator: Consultant:	Ms. Phyllis Hart Ms. Revonda Williams

Wednesday Afternoon

1:15 - 2:15 Session IV "Instructional Programming to Meet the Needs of the Minority Student"
Auditorium

Moderator: Dr. Hazel Small

Recorder: Ms. Joanne Johnston

Speaker: Mr. Charles E. Grigsby
Mathematics Department Coordinator
Southeastern Community College
Whiteville, North Carolina

2:15 - 2:30 Break

2:30 - 3:15 Discussion - Session IV

Group A A-17	Moderator: Consultant:	Dr. Lawrence Arney Ms. Revonda Williams
Group B E-110	Moderator: Consultant:	Ms. Sybil Reed Dr. Janice Kennedy
Group C E-111	Moderator: Consultant:	Mr. Jim Hamlet Mr. Charles E. Grigsby
Group D Auditorium	Moderator: Consultant:	Dr. Phillip Lewis Dr. John W. Lavery

3:15 - 4:15 Session V Conference Summary
Auditorium

Moderator: Dr. William R. Richardson

Recorder: Ms. Beverly Hawkins

Summary Forum: Consultants
Mr. Jim Hamlet

Adjournment

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The evaluation questionnaire was designed so that the responses from the participants would be most effective for planning continuing workshops. Responses, which are reported in percentages, were submitted by approximately seventy-five percent of the participants who remained in attendance throughout the proceedings.

I. Background Data. Please check the category which applies to you.

A. Position:

34.3 Administrator

48.6 Faculty Member

17.1 Other Staff

B. Institutional Status:

88.6 Two-year Institution

11.4 Senior Institution

C. Work Group:

28.6 A

25.7 B

22.9 C

22.9 D

II. Pre-Workshop Activities.

How would you rate the following pre-workshop activities?

	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
A. Initial Workshop Announcement and information materials	5.8	29.4	32.4	32.4
B. Registration process	2.9	8.8	41.2	47.1

III. Workshop Format.

What are your opinions about these particular aspects of the workshop format?

	Overall Scheduling	Consultant Presentations	Working Group Sessions
A. Workshop program structure.			
Too unstructured	0	8.8	15.2
About right	97.1	88.2	84.8
Too structured	2.9	3.0	0
B. Pace			
Too slow	9.1	6.1	14.7
About right	90.9	93.9	85.3
Too fast	0	0	0
C. Length			
Too short (needed more time)	5.9	3.0	22.9
About right	91.2	94.0	77.1
Too long	2.9	3.0	0
D. Content			
Too general & superficial	26.9	45.2	45.2
About right	73.1	54.8	54.8
Too specific & detailed	0	0	0

IV. Workshop Consultants.

A. How would you generally rate the workshop consultants on the following dimensions?

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. Proficient in content area	8.6	5.6	22.9	54.3	8.6
2. Ability to communicate ideas	11.4	5.7	14.3	57.2	11.4
3. Able to relate presentation to practice	5.8	20.6	26.5	32.4	14.7
4. Understanding of your concerns and problems	11.4	17.2	22.9	37.1	11.4
5. Interest in helping you and other participants	5.7	5.7	20.0	48.6	20.0

B. How would you rate the effectiveness of workshop consultant presentations in relation to your needs and interests?

11.4 Contributed strongly
51.4 Contributed moderately
34.3 Contributed slightly
2.9 Not relevant

V. Work Group Sessions.

How would you rate the effectiveness of participation in your work groups in relation to the consideration of the workshop theme?

35.3 Contributed strongly
32.3 Contributed moderately
26.5 Contributed slightly
5.9 Not relevant

VI. Would you recommend a workshop like this to other administrators, faculty, staff, and/or lay board members?

17.1 No

28.6 Yes, with reservations

54.3 Yes, with no reservations

The several discussion sessions provided the opportunity for the participants to address some of the major topics presented in the four addresses by the consultants. The diverse opinions from an equally diverse audience helped to maintain a very high degree of enthusiasm and concern throughout the workshop.

The following questions appeared to receive the greatest attention of the participants:

1. How can the public two-year colleges increase the opportunities for the minority student to achieve greater success in his academic program?

2. What role should the institution assume in meeting the social and economic needs of the minority students and how much of the institution's resources should be devoted to meet these needs?

3. Is not there a danger in thinking about designing instructional programs for minorities rather than designing them for people--individuals with some common needs?

4. Why do we need to concern ourselves (faculty and administration) with the social, economic and personal environments of minority students?

The unsolicited comments that have been received from many of the participants have emphasized the quality, usefulness and appropriateness of the workshop. Such comments seem to be indicative of the real value of the workshop.

"WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF A PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF MINORITY STUDENTS?"

Dr. John W. Lavery, President
John Tyler Community College

I have taken the liberty of slightly modifying my topic from a declarative statement to a question. It now reads: "What are the Responsibilities of a Public Two-Year Institution in Meeting the Needs of Minority Students?"

The answers to this question are difficult and complex. My presentation speaks to seven descriptive words as guidelines for responding to the question. Although there will be no attempt to answer this question, I will present a point of view for discussion purposes and offer an alternative or two. The theme of my remarks focuses on the need for comprehensive staff development programs.

I suggest that public two-year institutions must be responsive to the seven (7) D's of the seventies (70's) for minorities. The seven (7) D's are: 1) Development, 2) Dollars, 3) Disclosure, 4) Diversity, 5) Distribution, 6) Discontinuity, and 7) Depersonalization. These seven descriptive words will help us review where we are, and where we seem to be going as we move, now beyond the middle of the 1970's in this historic bicentennial year 1976. This is the year of all years to reflect upon our past and use the information and experience gained from it to plan for our future--especially if we note in our past problems that need to be rectified.

The seven D's I am presenting can be seen either as problems or opportunities. Being an external optimist, I choose to see them as opportunities.

I. Development

Development means to expand by a process of growth, to cause to unfold gradually. It is the facilitating of growth through planned change. Human development means to assist human beings to develop behaviors in order to be self-directed. Behavior includes all functions of a person. The more fully functioning people are, the more capable they are of interacting with their human and physical environment as equals rather than controlling or being controlled.

Education is an institution of society designed to facilitate behavioral development so that it occurs in the most effective and efficient manner. The discovery and transmission of knowledge is used by this institution as a principal means toward the goal of self-development. Education means in the literal sense, the act of leading out of. It is therefore the process by which man realizes his potential. Knowledge of self and the environment has always been considered a key element in the process. Most societal institutions have educational functions, but the educational institution is society's means to use knowledge to further the development of its members.

Educators are persons with expertise in the content of behaviors. They have achieved a high level of development of certain behaviors and thus may serve as

models for students who seek to develop these behaviors. These are our teachers. Educators are also persons with expertise in the process of behavioral development. They derive perspectives and insights from a multi-disciplinary base and from this base bring together the elements of an environment they can critically, creatively, and caringly facilitate the development of the individual and society. They are our counselors or student development specialists as they are now sometimes called.

Among the many processes that educators (teachers and counselors) collaborate on along with the student in order to facilitate behavioral development is to foster development within the context of the students own cultural heritage and to promote cross-cultural appreciation. Each unit of mankind develops a culture or peculiar trait of dealing with its total environment. The various cultures all appear to have advantages and disadvantages with no culture or group of cultures being inherently superior. Education as a cultural institution seeks to develop behaviors of its members within the context of its culture. The United States is a nation of many cultures but the educational institution tends to be attuned to only certain cultural groups. Thus, members of some cultures have had to discard their own cultural heritage and obtain membership in a "mainstream" culture in order to succeed educationally.

Educators should understand the culture of each student and assist him in his behavioral development so that his educational program is relevant and consistent with his own culture. The educational environment should be so structured that movement from one culture to another is facilitated when desired by the student involved but never required. Through his knowledge of cultures and their impact on development, the educator should seek to provide environments meaningful to each and to promote cross-cultural understanding and acceptance. This concept of cross-cultural understanding and equal opportunity has finally been accepted in principle in this country, but it falls far short in practice. This is the reason minority groups have difficult identifying with this country's institutions of education and very often end up being low-achievers. They are forced to identify with a "mainstream", very often alien, cultural heritage and learn through it. A very difficult task indeed.

Another of the ten major processes of behavioral development is to modify existing behaviors that block the further development of the student. Some students who have a normal development history and are functioning in an appropriate environment may find that specific behaviors they have acquired block further behavioral development. For example, test anxiety is likely to interfere with the assessment process. Educators, especially counselors, should have the skills that are needed for them to collaborate with students to modify such blocking behaviors which commonly occur.

Still another process of behavioral development and the last one to be used in this paper as an example of development is to develop values that enable the student to judge the worth of behaviors. If self-direction is the goal of education, it also is the criterion for judging the worth of behaviors. Those behaviors which do contribute to self-direction of all persons affected should be

valued, while behaviors that block self-direction should not be valued. Values clarification should be an important aspect of any educational system. Values must not be imposed but they do need to be clarified so that each individual chooses the values most appropriate for him from among alternatives. Values clarification allows the individual to clarify and verify his values from among alternatives. The best method of teaching values is for the college to practice them in its own behaviors.

II. Dollars

The question of dollars is a real issue in American education today. It is evident that there are not going to be dollars with which to operate as we have in the past. There are two primary reasons for the tightening of the dollars allocated to education: 1) the economic situation, the fact that there is less money proportionally available for many aspects of life, and 2) the status of education as a viable institution of American society. There is a need for change in our educational institutions. This need is both internal and external. One of the most critical internal pressures is generated by conflict between faculty and administrators. Many educational institutions find themselves locked into a labor-management situation, with the administrator as management and the faculty as labor. In this win-lose struggle for power, it is assumed that there is a fixed amount of power in the educational system. Any gain in power by one of the two parties must then result in a corresponding loss in power for the adversary. This situation is a far cry from the cooperative efforts needed to make an effective educational system. This type of internal conflict means loss in money and loss in effective programs for minority as well as all students.

One answer is more participation in the decision-making process or participatory management, where more people are involved in the decision-making process. It seems only right to have people who are going to have to live with decisions be an active part in making the decision. This does not mean everyone involved in decision-making per se, it merely means more people involved in the decision recommending process, so the decision-maker (s) will have more comprehensive information with which to make decisions. Minority students and faculty must become involved where the action is and this is one viable alternative to change. Here again, staff development programs are needed to provide the necessary training to assure active and appropriate participation.

One of the most critical external pressures is the demand for educational accountability. This has been defined in several ways, but the essence of the demand is "responsibility for outcomes." But who is to assume responsibility for learning outcomes? Who is to assure that the taxpayers' money is efficiently allocated to specific objectives? These are important questions both to educators and to lay persons. Questions of educational accountability cannot be answered without a clear statement of educational purpose. And herein lies the basic problem: many two-year colleges have lacked a clear definition of objectives, or a statement of expected outcomes. This lack of clearly stated educational objectives prevents the establishment of any meaningful accountability system for two-year colleges. In order to be effective, the public two-year institution must ask itself what must I do in order to succeed at providing equal opportunity for all students. When it

can state and respond to this question in objective, measurable terms, dollars will be available, because this assumes systematic accountability. To become more systematic and objective will set the stage for a win/win environment, where we will become more effective in terms of equal opportunity for all people and more accountable to the taxpayers, our funding source.

III. Disclosure

Disclosure relates very closely with dollars, because if we are systematic and accountable, we have the facts and will disclose them. The converse is also true; if we do not have the facts and therefore are not objective with our information, dollars will not be forthcoming.

As one publication I read suggests, the problems and issues of equal opportunity in higher education are becoming quite visible; it is the answers that are unseen. For the access, placement, retention and graduation of minority groups in higher education, the visibility of the problems may be their major advantage. If the answers cannot be seen clearly at the moment, it is not because the problems and issues of access are still obscured. The problems and issues of minority participation are at least in the open -- and therein lies hope for their eventual resolution.

The major concern and opportunity facing the public two-year institution is institutional effectiveness of policies that are ostensibly decided at the societal level. Equal opportunity is an accepted principle, it is not an established practice. The two-year institution must implement the practice of equal opportunity by integrating the concepts of access, placement, participation, retention and graduation for minority students.

The challenge to American education is to work through its confusions of purpose and mission for a realistic grasp on the specific role it must play in a pluralistic society, strongly committed to full participation and involvement on the part of all its citizens. To do so, educational leadership must re-establish its own credibility with the public it presumably serves. Higher education must re-assert its own leadership within the larger framework of school and society. How well educational leadership can meet this challenge is not visible. The two-year institution is in the most appropriate position to be a leader of leaders in this re-asserting process. Staff development is essential.

IV. Diversity

Diversity means providing programs and opportunities for the different backgrounds, abilities, values and attitudes of peoples attending a comprehensive public two-year institution. It means correlating and integrating program development with student development, the first of the 7 D's for the Seventies.

Program development means to offer programs to students to assist them with their process of behavioral development. Modeling is a major avenue for developing behaviors. While knowledge can be acquired without the presence of a model, the

integration, internalization and application of knowledge resulting in behavioral change or learning are usually facilitated by modeling. Teachers are modelers. In traditional teaching, indistinct and remote goals are danger signs in a curriculum for low achievers. Marginal students are idealistic, but they are also practical. They want their means (instruction) to be dramatic, interesting and relevant, and their ends (knowledge and skill) to be well defined and immediate. This is why alternative methods of teaching and learning must be available for all students, and especially minority students -- in order to meet the learning needs of the various individual cognitive styles associated with cultural differences.

An individual's cognitive style is determined by the way he takes note of his total surroundings -- how one seeks meaning, how one becomes informed. Is he a listener or a reader? Is she concerned only with her own viewpoint or is she influenced in decision-making by her family or associates? Does he reason as a mathematician, or as a social scientist, or as an auto mechanic? These are just a few facets of the human makeup that we must become aware of and do something about in order to facilitate learning for the minority student. Dr. Joseph Hill at Oakland Community College in Michigan has developed what he calls the Educational Sciences, with an emphasis on Cognitive Style Mapping. Hill's method is based on the assumption that man continually seeks to derive meaning from his environment and personal experiences in many ways. The Educational Sciences provide a framework for mapping a student's cognitive style or in other words, determining the way he learns best. When we begin to implement programs such as this, and we must, we will also have to offer alternative academic programs and learning techniques to complement the individual styles. We have a great many alternatives at the present time, it is merely a matter of knowing how, when and where to use them. Cognitive Style Mapping will help, but there is also a need for a change in attitude on the part of many educators. We need to offer in all of our programs a balance of the three P's -- processes, people, and properties: process being methods -- maintaining a balance between lectures, small groups, programmed instruction, video tapes, etc.; people meaning a team effort between and among students, teachers, counselors, administrators and other human resources; and properties meaning materials, equipment, facilities and other soft- and hardware. The responsibility of the public two-year institution in meeting the needs of minority students is to offer alternatives, and balanced programs for individual cognitive styles, and to be accountable for them.

V. Distribution

Distribution asks the question -- how do students distribute themselves across the breadth of education? Are students being distributed according to interest and abilities, or are they being categorized, pigeon-holed and over-specialized? Increases in size, specialization, and automation have produced complex inhuman organizations with a tendency to categorize, specialize, and mass produce. Organizations devised to serve men have, by their complexity, cancerous growth, and resistance to planned change, turned men into their servants. The tail very often wags the dog. And no one gets caught and hurt in this process any more than

does the minority student. He is forced into an alien environment and with very little assistance and understanding is expected to cope and succeed. If the public two-year institution is to be effective and succeed, it will have to overcome and prevail with the increased pressures of size, specialization, and automation. It must not fall into the trap of the high school and four-year college. It must dare to be different. The public two-year college must have clearly defined mission and goals, it must be flexible and objective and above all it must be human.

VI. Discontinuity

Continuity in higher education has always been a myth even though we have refused to accept it. Now we accept discontinuity as a way of life. By discontinuity we mean students who stop-in and then stop-out. Those who come and get a course or two and then leave. They may or may not get what they need at the time, but the point is a high percentage will be back later in life for more course work or for something else. Many have their immediate need met, and it becomes an incentive to return later. Others out of necessity have to stop at some point and then return at a later time. The important thing is that we in public two-year institutions see this phenomena as positive and plan for it. Until now we have refused to accept it. It has always been with us to some degree, but we have ignored it. We must now gear our educational systems for discontinuity since the flow will be increasingly more in that direction. Life-long learning, a phrase often used today, assumes discontinuity, or students who stop-in get what they need at the time, leave, and then return later when there is again a need.

Another variable now affecting discontinuity is what is being called "mid-career" change. Minorities, especially women, are heavily involved in either getting back into a career or just beginning a new career after the family has grown up and left home. Men in various aspects of business and industry are finding their jobs unrewarding midway through life, and are going back to college to get into a new field. Retired military personnel are also finding that retirement at an early age is unrewarding, and with the present economic situation there is need to supplement the retirement income. All of this focuses on the fact that the public two-year institution with its service-oriented philosophy must plan and act on discontinuity in education.

VII. Depersonalization

The problem of depersonalization in our educational system increases as the dollar becomes tighter. Again, increases in size, specialization and automation also have a tendency to depersonalize and alienate people if steps are not taken to prevent it from happening. It is essential as society moves faster, knowledge and technology increase rapidly, and the dollars decrease that we plan for personalizing education. During these times effective and efficient planning is the means by which personalized education can be achieved. These are good signs and attempts at personalizing education. Several factors have stimulated efforts to meet the educational needs of students of all types in a more personal, less bureaucratic and professionalized fashion than has been common for some years.

It seems likely that the disruptions of the 1960's have sensitized educators to the necessity to attend to affective as well as cognitive factors in the lives of students. Undoubtedly, the demands by minority groups and the disadvantaged for educational programs with a strong element of personal attention have generated some interest and demand for similar treatment from other students, especially when needs are comparable.

Mass education is both an economic necessity and highly efficient in many circumstances. For many activities it is the only feasible answer. For others it is not suitable. The nature of the need or activity is what is important. As colleges have grown large it has become increasingly important to recognize and cope with these needs that require personal attention. Probably more important to most students than having an individual problem solved with professional efficiency is the need to be treated as a unique person and to find compatible people on the college staff, as well as among students, who recognize and value that unique personality, and with whom common interests can be shared. Walz (1970) has pointed out that man does not need to lose individuality nor does the system need to become impersonal just because technology becomes a major aspect of processes involved in dealing with student problems and needs. Yet, to avoid depersonalization, a considerable level of sophistication and careful integration of technological processes with those functions that can only be offered by humans is essential. Indeed as Wallenfeldt (1971) has stated, in an ideal situation, technological systems are necessary to provide the highest level of personalized service to all students. In other words, efficient use of technology should provide us with more services and more time so we can be more effective educators of equal opportunity. This is nice rhetoric, however we are not there yet. I am convinced it can be done, and it is going to have to be the two-year public institution that does it.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, I would like to consider an eighth D, one which is an umbrella D for the seven D's of the Seventies. It puts the seven D's in perspective and sets the stage for the future. The eighth D is decisions. The public two-year institution must make some hard decisions about equal opportunity and bite the bullet, as the saying goes, concerning all of the former seven D's. Public two-year institutions must assist minority students with their behavioral development so that their educational programs are relevant and consistent with their own culture. Dollars will be available only if the two-year college provides equal opportunity for all students in an effective, accountable manner. The problems and issues of equal opportunity are quite visible, the challenge is to make the answers visible -- make the move from principle to practice. We need to offer diverse programs for minority students and within each one maintain a balance of the three P's -- process, people, and property. Size, specialization, and automation are necessary in a massive beauocratic society, but we must be aware of the dangers of categorizing and specializing people. We need to distribute people across education according to interest and ability in a very human way. Discontinuity is not new to higher education, but planning for it and seeing it as a positive force are new. We must build it into our educational system as one aspect of the life-long learning process. And above all, we must personalize education. People need to be treated as

people. Each person is unique and needs to be treated as such. The public two-year institution must utilize technological systems efficiently so as to allow educators to work with all people effectively. To assure effectiveness high priority must be given to the development of comprehensive staff development programs. It seems to me the decisions the public two-year institution makes concerning the above seven opportunities will determine its effectiveness, and the extent to which the principles of equal opportunity are put into practice.

"SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING MINORITY STUDENTS"

Revonda Williams
Assistant to the President
Mountain Empire Community College

The two basic questions we must ask ourselves are: 1) What are the socio-economic factors that affect minority students? and 2) How are the students affected? It is not my intention to draw conclusions for you but to refresh your memories concerning the social and economic backgrounds of many of our students. Each institution must draw its own conclusions as to how it will serve the needs of the students it serves.

Before we can address these two questions, we must first define what we mean by minority students. John Roueche in his book A Modest Proposal speaks of the nontraditional or disadvantaged student to include blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, and southern rural or mountain whites. "Their culture has failed to provide them with experiences typical of the youth that colleges are accustomed to teaching. As a result, student bodies in two-year colleges will become increasingly complex and diverse." Patricia Cross in her book, Beyond the Open Door, describes the new students in postsecondary education as "Caucasians whose fathers work at blue-collar jobs and who were not especially successful in their high school work. A substantial number of the new students are members of minority ethnic groups." For purposes of our discussion, I will define minority students as being those students who are socially and/or economically disadvantaged whether they be black, Indian, or rural white.

Let us consider the first question: What are the socio-economic factors that may affect disadvantaged students? The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, which has recently been extended, delineated a region containing 397 counties in 13 states as being socio-economically disadvantaged. The thirteen states are Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, the only entire state within the Appalachian region. This cluster of counties was designated by ARC as needing special attention due to the common characteristics of the people located in the mountainous geographical area within each of these states.

In an effort to profile these common characteristics and also to lend credibility to the discussion, I want to describe to you an Appalachian geographical area comprised of three counties with one of those counties being the poorest in the state. I prefer to describe these specific three counties rather than quote you the 1970 census data or national statistics that have been collected because I can testify to the reliability of the information. This is the service area that my institution serves. As I describe the socio-economic factors affecting this area, will you please think in terms of your institution--its terrain, the road conditions, the disadvantaged people it serves, their educational level, their economical backgrounds, the major industries influencing your economy, the housing conditions of the disadvantaged in your area, the population growth rate, the unemployment rate, the ratio of males to females and the racial composition of its constituencies.

Profile

The district or the institution's service area lies in the heart of what was traditionally thought of as "hard core" Appalachia. The mountains, coal mines, isolation, and human needs of the people in the district are similar to those of other areas of Appalachia. These characteristics and the general plight of the entire region have been examined in great detail. Even though some variation exists from state to state and locality to locality within the region, the difference is minute in comparison to the remainder of the nation. The district comprises 4,400 square miles of land which is generally characterized by steep slopes and rugged terrain. The very land itself has been a major influence on the growth patterns of the region as it obviously hinders development, reduces travel, and constricts surface waters to the narrow valleys created by the steep slopes.

The climate is humid sub-tropical. The average annual temperature over the district is 53 degrees Fahrenheit, though extremes up to 105 degrees Fahrenheit and as low as -27 degrees Fahrenheit have been recorded. The area receives approximately 47 inches of rainfall per year with an average of 18 inches of snow included in that figure.

Since 1940, the state's population growth rate has increased but that of the district has declined. The area decreased in population by approximately 18 percent from 1960-1970 while the state as a whole increased by more than 14 percent. This change reflects the problems encountered by the coal industry and graphically illustrates the massive out-migration patterns of the 20-year period from 1950-1970.

In spite of the high out-migration especially of young people during the fifties and sixties, there continued to be a high rate of unemployment with over fifty percent of the families in three counties receiving an income of under $3,000 per year. While this trend for high unemployment continues, it is due, in part, to the general economic recession experienced nationwide.

One-fourth of the housing units in the district are considered to be of a deteriorated nature, with another twelve percent totally dilapidated. These figures reflect field surveys made in 1970 and do not take into account the recent growth of mobile homes and subdivisions. Substandard housing is still a very prevalent problem but appears to be lessening in this decade.

Limited educational and skill levels compound the problem of adjusting to new jobs. The median years of school completed by the population 25 years old and older vary from 6th to 8th grade education whereas the average for the nation is 10.6 grade level. Of the population 7-15 years old, approximately six percent are not enrolled in school, compared with three percent for the nation. The expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance is well below the state county median and there is a lower proportion of teachers with advanced degrees. Educational television facilities are available on a somewhat limited basis and public libraries have traditionally been lacking throughout the region.

In the past decades, population growth in the district has generally paralleled that of the other rural Appalachian areas of the United States. Absolute population increases have been non-existent until very recent years, being replaced by a substantial loss of residents due to out-migration to urban areas.

The significant population decline experienced between 1950 and 1970 resulted from changes in the three basic components of the population: births, deaths, and out-migration. Over the past 25 years, birth rates declined from 24.5 per thousand in 1945 to 20.3 per thousand in 1970; the death rate increased from 8.4 deaths per thousand in 1945 to 11.6 in 1970; and the number of residents that have left the district since 1940 has exceeded 30,000 persons. As a result of the trends in the components of population change within the district, the age-sex composition has also been changing.

As in other Appalachian areas, the most significant age composition changes have been in the younger and older age segments of the population. For instance, the percentage of the population under 15 years of age has decreased twelve percent during the past ten years; and the percentage of the population over 55 years of age has increased five percent in the past ten years.

Another significant change in the sex composition of the region's population has been the decline in the ratio of males to females. This is generally an extension of a long term trend resulting from the fact that females tend to have longer life expectancies than males, amplified in an area where large scale "deep" coal mining is the primary occupation of males. The hazards inherent in this occupation are well known.

The racial composition of the district changed slightly in the decade of the 1960's. As a percentage of the total population, racial minorities comprise two and three-tenths percent.

In 1960, the median family income was $1,856.00. This figure had increased to $3,901.00 in 1970. In general, per capita income has been considerably lower than the state per capita income level.

This brings us to the second question: How do these geographical, economical, and cultural conditions affect disadvantaged students? Because of the geographical location and the lack of opportunity for formalized education, most parents of the disadvantaged student never attended college. This makes many of the students the first-generation college student. The disadvantaged student views postsecondary education as a way to a better job for a better life than that of their parents. Most students are looking for a salable skill. These students have not been especially successful at their high school studies and generally rank in the lower third of their high school graduating class.

The disadvantaged students have some common characteristics as a result of this cultural background, such as, low economic status, low social status, low educational achievement, low per capita family incomes, limited

participation in community organizations, and limited potential for immediate upward mobility. Considering all these factors, Patricia Cross advocates that the present forms of education are inappropriate for the "New Student." Developmental, remedial, and other forms of education need to be developed and implemented in order to better serve these students.

One of the major contentions in higher education today is the Open Door admission policy. This policy states that any high school graduate, or any person over 18 years of age who seems capable of profiting by the instruction offered, is eligible for admission. Therefore, we accept students who are low-achievers; but once admitted, they are expected to compete in traditional programs of study. In many instances the student from the beginning is predestined to academic failure. Even if you have good academic and career counseling, if there are no appropriate programs for the low achievers, in what do they enroll?

Once an institution determines the socio-economic factors affecting their students, how does it determine those educational objectives that will have a positive impact on the clientele or area it serves? An example in our area was the unbelievable number of young people who left the area. The college needed to determine why the people were leaving the area and what would keep them in the area. There is an old saying in the region that when a student graduates from high school he doesn't receive a diploma but instead receives a road map.

We felt we knew the answer as to why the people left the area, which was the lack of jobs. In order to find out what the young were thinking, we surveyed all high school juniors and seniors in our service area. Over eighty percent said they would like to remain in the area if jobs were available and if recreation facilities were available.

Meanwhile, the college surveyed some 14,000 heads of households and spouses. (We have approximately 22,000 households in our area.) We discovered that the adults expressed an interest in either skill courses such as typing, bookkeeping, sewing, or purely recreational type courses such as bridge, yoga, ceramics, and the like. Little interest was shown in such courses as literature, history, sociology, English with one exception--a very successful course in Appalachian culture.

We took all of the information gathered into consideration in planning our programs. Since we are limited in providing recreation for our young, we decided to concentrate on providing the needed skills for employment. We discovered in talking with potential employers that there was a need for skilled employees but there was a tendency to be skeptical of the young. To help alleviate this problem, an aggressive cooperative education program was started and has met with tremendous success. A Family College Night program was started. This program allowed families to attend college together two nights a week with courses for everyone, including babysitting services for toddlers. A Learning-in-Transit project was conceived and funded by ARC

which purchased five mobile learning units to allow students to take courses in transit to the college each day to help maximize the long travel time for many students. Other similar projects have been started based upon the social or economic needs of the citizens in our area.

John Kenneth Galbraith, an economist and former American Ambassador to India, stated in his book, The Affluent Society: "People are poverty-stricken when their income, even if adequate for survival, falls behind that of the community." George Bernard Shaw, one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the poor, stated that "the first duty of every man was to avoid being poor." Robert Hunter wrote in his book, Poverty, published in 1904: "We are perhaps too prone to think of those in poverty as effortless beings, who make no fight for themselves and wail in misery until someone comes to assist them. Such an opinion is without any foundation."

In conclusion, I want to say to you that in poverty there is still pride. Much of that pride has been stripped by welfare, food stamps, and other federal subsidies which are badly needed in many cases. Nevertheless, many of our students maintain a certain quality of pride instilled by their parents. Each institution has to decide how it will work with the disadvantaged student and if the cultural and economic background should or will be taken into consideration when developing curricula. As stated in the beginning, I have not drawn conclusions, as each of you must do that, but, hopefully, have given you a common basis for discussion in the small groups to follow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

John Kenneth Galbraith, The Affluent Society, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1958.

K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1971.

Grant Venn, Man, Education, and Manpower, American Association of School Administrators, 1970.

John E. Roueche, A Modest Proposal: Students Can Learn, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1972.

Robert Hunter, Poverty, The McMillan Co., New York, 1904.

Herman P. Miller, Poverty American Style, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., U. S. Bureau of the Census, Belmont, California, 1967.

John E. Roueche & R. Wade Kirk, Catching Up: Remedial Education, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1973.

"PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING MINORITY STUDENTS"

Dr. Janice Kennedy
Assistant to the President
S. D. Bishop State Junior College

It is most satisfying to know that even after the affluent sixties, staff development conferences and workshops such as this one continue to be concerned with the success of minority students as they receive training in the community colleges.

O'Banion states:

> The quality of education in the community-junior college depends primarily on the quality of the staff. Community-junior colleges can enroll increasing numbers of students; they can develop a variety of educational programs; they can house these students and programs in attractive facilities; but all these efforts will avail little if their staff are not highly competent and well prepared for the unique tasks assigned them by this new venture in American education.

Staff development through the use of faculty in-service training has been one of the basic needs as expressed by community-junior college faculty members and administrators since the early 1960's. While the senior colleges and universities were facing massive student unrest during this period, the community-junior college was witnessing its largest enrollments in the history of the movement. How well do we remember the "sterling years" of the sixties--characterized by large enrollments, new community colleges being developed throughout the country, a great deal of financial support and programs designed and developed to meet the needs of the large numbers of minority students. These large enrollments of "new" or "emerging" students with varied academic and socio-economic backgrounds caused many faculty members in these new and emerging institutions to reassess their training in view of the range of needs of these students.

William Moore reminded us in 1970 that:

> There was a time when missionary zeal rather than teaching skill motivated many faculty members to give instruction to the educationally disadvantaged. That day has passed. The faculty members in the community-junior colleges today are faced by inquiring, ambitious students--even when they are marginal. Helping these students to compensate for previous social and educational deprivation, while preparing them to compete in a highly complex society demands teaching skills of the highest order. The faculty member who faces this problem can hardly remain unprepared or futile. He must, on the contrary, be interested, inventive, and hardworking; but most of all he should be well-trained and sensitive.

The faculty member must be "sensitive and well-trained" to meet the needs of minority students who may come to us as: adult learners (27 years and older), part-time students, recent graduates of local high schools, reverse transfer students (those who have previously attended four-year colleges and universities), married students with families, unmarried students with families, veterans, day students, evening students, weekend students, housewives, urban and rural students and, of course, the marginal as well as the academically talented.

He is black and white and brown
and red and yellow and pink
And rainbow-like arrayed.

He is a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew,
a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Hindu,
And even a Jesus freak.

He lives in a slum, a ghetto, an alley,
a patch somewhere across the tracks
Of orderly structured places.

His family is matriarchal, patriarchal,
broken, deserted, extended, nuclear,
Big and whole and even together.

He eats little sometimes, much sometimes
nothing sometimes and sometimes even
A planned hot meal.

He is never sick unless he plans to die
but sick much-dying ever.

Yet

He breathes, he lives, he laughs, cries,
dreams and schemes, works and plays,
Loves and forgets -- always striving for
a hold on the chain which raises all
Men from the bottom up to where they want to go.

Certainly the community-junior college is an institution where a diverse faculty meet a diverse student population and varying attempts are made to aid in the development of these students in a multiplicity of ways -- special programs, special courses and strong support services represent some of our attempts.

However, how many times have we found ourselves -- having defined a particular student problem or need -- moved forward to develop what we considered to be the almost ideal solution to the defined problem, secured necessary funds, only to find midway the implementation of our well-conceived idea that "it just won't work"?

How many times have we developed what we considered to be strong support services -- tutorial assistance, peer counseling, career development centers and special seminars to deal with problem areas and we could go on and on -- only to find that those students who need the support are not involved and are not receiving the services?

How many times have we all admitted at some point that our remedial and developmental courses are not doing the job? That our interdisciplinary studies programs are not presenting interrelated knowledge but, fragmented "snatches" of information, being imparted by a group of confused faculty members to an equally confused group of students?

These are familiar occurrences to some of us and faculty members experience utter frustration as they attempt to define "Where did we go wrong?" and "What do we do now?"

I contend that special programs, special activities and special services designed to meet the special needs of the minority students on our campuses must be continuously developed, funded, implemented, revised and evaluated. However, I further contend that throughout the design phase of any program, any activity or any service and on into the implementation and evaluation phases, continuing faculty development, with an "awareness" element, is a real necessity if the success of the student being served by the program, the activity, or the support service is to be realized to any great extent.

An "awareness" element would deal with such questions as those chosen from your conference -- "Who are these minority students?", "Why are they here?", "What are their needs and their aspirations?", "How do we program for their success?" Such difficult yet such necessary questions!

Would it not be comfortable if we could just for a while pretend that our purpose is to impart all of those knowledges that we gained from our dear alma maters. Just think, if we could just once get through the designated text chosen for our favorite course, our students just may become successful citizens and they just may get a good job -- some even teaching in the community colleges. Those of us who have chosen to work in the community college cannot afford such luxuries even in our thinking. The minority student armed with all of his needs, socio-economic and psychological, has found his way to the "open door" and he expects us to fulfill all of those beautiful missions that we have in our college catalogs. This is a big order!

Psychologists tell us that we can all endure prolonged deprivations, but we cannot survive without our basic physiological needs. We must have minimal amounts of air, food, water, activity, sleep and rest. In our affluent society, it is usually relatively easy to satisfy these vital needs. The socio-economic needs, once recognized, can also be satisfied through various avenues; but the psychological needs present a more complex and demanding problem. These are the needs that are shaped by the way an

individual sees himself in relation to his environment as well as by his day-to-day interaction with others. One can readily understand that an "awareness" of these needs is the most difficult to achieve. This "awareness" is communicated to those of us within the community-junior colleges most times through the non-verbal and inter-actions of our minority students. What are their attitudes toward education, toward the classroom and toward the instructors?

In 1970, Gordon Morgan conducted a study under the auspices of the American College Testing Program. This study, entitled The Ghetto College Student: A descriptive Essay on College Youth From the Inner City, described some of the problems and conditions of the minority student which influence his education. The study revealed that minority students, particularly blacks, face education in general with attitudes of defeatism, bitterness, insecurity, and as a group-oriented person.

Defeatism. Many of us emphasize that minority students are not as fervent in their upward mobility as they should be. These students have been alienated, confused, beaten down, preached to, talked about and despised, and we have to be prepared to drag them to success rather than just offer the gentle pushes other students require.

This minority student comes from a culture that is lurking with defeatism. He comes from an environment where he has been forced to live with defeat and uncertainty. His environmental problems are overwhelming and would be a source of constant hurt and anxiety for him unless he developed means of controlling them. How does he control them? To keep from feeling hurt in any type of comparison with others from more favorable backgrounds, the minority student avoids comparison. In his thinking, defeat is a normal part of his existence and is to be viewed along with the other hardships of life. He is not excited about it. It's there, it's "the way things s'posed to be." Are we aware of this factor?

Bitterness. The usual description of the minority student includes the word "bitterness." This bitterness is the result of his trying to grapple with the many frustrations encountered most of his life. He enters the "open door" armed with bitterness and this is often manifest in his speech and his actions. It makes it difficult for instructors to work with him and most often results in his isolation on the campus. Are we aware of this factor?

Insecurity. Because of having had no stable home life, the minority student has been forced to take to the streets early. His childhood years have been compressed into a short span of life and he has often had to assume an adult role by the time he reaches his early teens. We as community-junior college instructors may be faced with behavior which is really a manifestation of childhood insecurity in the student.

The Group-Oriented Person. Mass psychology is a familiar concept to all of us. The minority student is a "group" or "crowd" man. Just observe his behavior while he is a member of a group; he is not an individualist. He finds his strength in a group. Group action is a way of life where he comes from -- there's always something going on. Are we aware of this factor?

Attitudes in the Classroom

Beating the System. Minority students, by virtue of the desperate economic situation, are oriented toward beating the system as a means of survival. These students have reasoned that having a degree will open some employment doors, and degrees are given by the academic system. He enters the system, finds insensitive teachers, programs and courses not suitable for his needs, and an academic climate filled with "just tolerate him for awhile." Quickly the decision is made that the system is like all the others; it's corrupt; it's insensitive; and it deserves to be beaten. Are we aware of this factor?

Some Work and Quality Work. The minority student sees no difference. Are we aware of this factor?

Deficiencies. The minority student finds it difficult to admit weakness or insufficiency. He strongly feels that within our colleges, where the avowed purpose is to help him, it would be a compromise of self-sufficiency to ask for or accept help. His survival must serve as proof of his competence and he does not like to admit to academic shortcomings. Are we aware of this factor?

Attitudes Toward Instructors

Teacher Alienation. The minority student views teachers as punitively-oriented individuals. They find no encouragement in terms of building self-confidence, even though we may realize that this is what the student lacks. Lectures on "self-confidence" won't do the job. They only confirm the student's own feeling of his lack of worth. Are we aware of this factor?

Faculty Aloofness. Some of our minority students say that we are aloof and that we act as if we look down on them. If these students could help us develop new ideas or if they were interested in learning skills, theories, approaches, or new systems of logic which we enjoy, maybe our relations would be better. Were we interested in all of this when we were freshmen and sophomores? Are we aware of this factor of faculty aloofness?

These ideas are not new to you. Most of these same factors came out during the many conversations and discussions during my stay with you. How do you "deal with" all of these factors? It's overwhelming, I know. But these are the best times during this period of financial stringency characterized by no travel budgets and a tight job market for teachers to create and design honest "awareness" staff development activities on your own campuses, using your own available resources in an attempt to solve your own problems -- all the while keeping in mind that the success of your students is the ultimate objective.

"INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMMING TO MEET
THE NEEDS OF THE MINORITY STUDENT"

Dr. Charles E. Grigsby
Coordinator, Department of Mathematics
Southeastern Community College

The raison d'etre of the community college system in North Carolina is and has always been to meet the educational need of a pluralistic population. These are people who are eighteen-year-old high school dropouts and people who are retirees, sixty-five years of age or older. Included in the service population are people who want to learn a trade, eventually earn a Ph.D. or take recreational courses for enjoyment and to make life richer and more meaningful. These are people who look to the community college system to upgrade their skills with a specific course or two; others register to learn how to do something they have always wanted to do, but have never had an opportunity to learn.

Some of these people are in prison. Some are officers in a local bank. Of course, some are black, Caucasian and Indian, with each of these classifications having meaningful subclassifications such as Southeastern black or Appalachian white or Lumbee Indian. A large number of them are women.

None of this is new to any of you here, I am sure, but there is a point to be made and that point is this: We are in the minority business!

Let us get our terminology squared away at the outset. "Minority" does not necessarily imply fewer numbers. As a mathematician I have a little trouble with that, but language is a living and, therefore, changing thing and words come to mean what they come to mean with total disregard for what they "should" mean. A case in point: Women have become the new "minority." A group of people will be referred to as a minority group if:

1) they have some more or less common educational needs which in the past have not been met as completely as the educational needs of some other groups; or,

2) they have deliberately or inadvertently been discriminated against in ways which reduce their capacity to choose.

The two parts of this definition are of course overlapping. For example, the black adult who received separate, but decidedly unequal, educational experiences may, as a result, find himself in a state of economic deprivation which reduces severely his life choices.

Incidentally, Dr. John McConahay at Duke University has recently co-authored a study which found that while overt suppression of black people may be at last on the way out, it is being replaced by what they call

"symbolic racism" which shows up as resentment of black successes or as diametrical disagreement with the set of values associated with the black community. Unless and until the members of the black community can gain more control over their lives through education and enlightened political power, then racism of any shade or hue will be doubly damaging.

But that's where as educators we come in. What should our role be? In a national newsletter published by Phi Delta Kappa, Nottingham and Ferris of the University of Southern California have recently proposed a major revision in the criteria for high school graduation. Performance based, one of the criteria would require that each student be able to demonstrate a proficiency in mathematics, for example, at a very practical level. But another criterion which stirred my interest was and I quote:

> Each student must demonstrate a knowledge of pluralism in American society by presenting orally or in writing the similarities (at least three) and differences (at least three) of a person whose cultural background is different from his own.[1]

Maybe this would help, but minorities (by my definition) do exist on all college campuses and it is incumbent on each educator to come to grips with the concomitant problems.

Minority Program Evaluation

Last month the American Council on Education published a booklet entitled Framework for Evaluating Institution Commitment to Minorities. The format is a series of questions under the various categories of institutional operations. Under the heading of "curriculum," the following questions are posed for the purpose of stimulating discussion.

A. How is the regular curriculum assessed for adequacy in study and analysis of works by minority authors and works focusing on minority concerns and experience? Are adequate means available for introducing more works of these kinds into the curriculum?

B. Do the institution's libraries and bookstores regularly carry publications by minority authors and publications devoted to minority issues? How is the completeness of inventories in this area verified?

C. How are changes in curriculum and teaching methods assessed to determine their influences on the education of minority students? Are the educational needs and interests of minority students used as the bases for revisions in curriculum and teaching methods? By what means are these needs and interests explored?

D. Is there an institutional mechanism for assessing the amount of undergraduate and graduate research being conducted on minority concerns? How can research of this type be encouraged?

E. How closely related are the subject matter and teaching methods of the regular curriculum to the subject matter and teaching methods of support service courses?

F. How successful are teaching techniques in support service courses introduced into the regular curriculum? How are faculty members encouraged to develop skill in using effective techniques?

G. How accepted, stable, and integral are ethnic and cultural studies at the institution? Are ethnic studies offerings properly publicized?[2]

Again, these questions are to be taken more in a descriptive sense rather than a prescriptive one, with each institution making decisions as to their appropriateness and with each institution setting the criteria for a resulting evaluation.

A study by Davis and Burkheimer on the effect of special services programs in higher education was published in June of last year by the Educational Testing Service. In it the authors make specific recommendations to higher education for "...the more effective establishment, revision, and operation of the programs...."[3]

a. Institutions considering admission of, and/or support programs for, disadvantaged students should make careful study to insure that the institutional objectives are compatible, commitment is honest, recent experience with minority/poverty students has been sustaining if not trouble-free, and that a potential program director who evidences clear commitment to students, credibility and rapport with faculty, and sufficient fiscal responsibility, administrative skill, and judgment is available.

b. The administrative structure, or institutional lines of authority, should be clearly specified to assure more than casual response to needs and problems that may develop, i.e., faculty hostility, disruptive incident, needs for curricular change, reordering institutional budget priorities, etc.

c. The institution should recognize that the "new" students will bring special interests and needs, such as courses of personal cultural relevance, occasional privacy with like peers, and sustaining social outlets. It should

also be recognized that many disadvantaged students must establish or re-establish an identity and self-regard that may ultimately yield new skill in interacting with individuals of different backgrounds and values. These needs apply to all students, of course, but on most campuses, they are better met for traditional students.

d. Institutions should be careful to take whatever action seems necessary to reduce or remove the stigma frequently attached to such operations as special support or remedial efforts and often associated with such terms as "disadvantaged" or high risk.

e. The availability of support services must be publicized so that students who might profit from such services are prompted to seek them out.

f. Special care needs to be taken when several diverse racial/ethnic groups are accommodated in one program to insure fair and equitable treatment and to insure that provision is made for the separate needs that may vary more as a function of ethnic subculture than of poverty or of some generalized notion of being disadvantaged.

g. Program directors should make special effort to enlist the honest and sensitive support of the teaching faculty, who, after all, control the ultimate destiny of the student through their grading systems and through their versatility as effective instructional agents. There are no winners in open warfare between program directors and their students on the one hand and the teaching faculty on the other.

h. The program director should concern himself with a thoughtful and realistic budget, being careful not to take on so much activity or so many students that the program impact is vitiated. In addition, careful, thoughtful, and specific program objectives and goals should be established.

i. Although easement of financial problems is needed by all poverty-origin students, the institution, in planning its program, should consider the very real possibility of what is effective with members of another racial group. The support program must deal intelligently with the ethnic differences if truly equal opportunity for reasonable and sustaining achievement is realized.

j. Careful, rigorous, and honest evaluation needs to be built in or required if programs are to be progressively improved. At a minimum, cumulative records of student achievement and progress must be maintained, and this record contrasted against that of students outside the program. Evaluation should focus "soft" data as well (e.g., students in the program will have particular experiences and thoughts worth considering).[4]

I am of the opinion that evaluation is of much more importance than is usually attributed to it. It not only serves as a basis for program improvement, but also serves an accountability function and reduces the legitimate basis on which minority programs can be attacked by their critics.

A model for evaluation of special services programs has been given by Vivio. The general steps are:

1) Prepare for evaluation by obtaining the appropriate commitments and through planning.

2) Evaluate past data as a basis for procedural guidelines. The analysis should include aptitude scores, G.P.A.'s, ethnic composition and other characteristics of the institution which are relevant.

3) Identify student needs: These may include psychological, cognitive, financial, or physical needs.

4) State goals and objectives, both in the cognitive and in the affective areas along with criteria necessary for measurement.

5) Define the processes that must be used to collect the necessary data.

6) Draft models that elucidate the relationships between program components.

7) Modify the process to make any necessary changes in procedures or responsibilities before data collection and organization begin.

8) Run a pilot or simulated study to test the feasibility of the design.[5]

Many of the instruments used for data collection will be most appropriately created by the evaluators. The chief advantage being that in this way instrumentation is designed specifically for the task at hand. This advantage frequently out-weighs the disadvantages of very limited generalization and the necessity of investing a significant part of the available evaluation resources in instrument construction.[6]

The Nature of Instruction Programming for Minorities

Many of these recommendations and evaluation procedures for special services programs are equally appropriate to any type of minority programs. A Sloan Foundation study discovered that in 1970 only 3% of the nation's engineers were black, Chicano, Puerto Rican or American-Indian. Partially as a result of this and similar findings there exists today at 51 colleges and universities programs to encourage and support an increase in the number of minority engineers. NASA is supporting this endeavor by awarding twenty fellowships to minority students at seven colleges and universities.

Unfortunately, there is very little known about the best ways to go about educating minority students which help alleviate the disadvantages in our society of their minority status.[7] In general, however, a learning activity is more meaningful if it:

1) Gets the students actively involved,

2) Is related to their experiences in their own culture,

3) Is something the student can be successful at,

4) Is something that they can help plan, and

5) Helps the students to know each other well.[8]

Quoting Bergeson and Miller with reference to younger students:

> The teacher's principal problem is learning to appreciate and understand the values and behaviors the child brings from his culture, although he must... be sure that he is seeing the individual child and <u>his</u> culture rather than a general class of people and their culture.[9]

The teacher's or counselor's problem can of course be alleviated if he is himself identified as a member of the broad minority classification of his students, which leads into the final point which I would like to make. In the March 1975 edition of <u>Change</u> Magazine, Orlando Patterson, a black professor of sociology at Harvard, expressed a view which has profound implications for minority education. According to Professor Patterson, "the depressing conclusion...should now be clear. Increasing ethnic cohesiveness implies increasing individual conformity, groupism, or declining individuality."[10]

If this is true, and I believe that it is, we are doing people a disservice when we label them, lump them together under rather narrow classification headings or characterize them by the "group" to which they have been somewhat arbitrarily assigned. Furthermore, this may be true however honorable our intentions are, for we are encouraging them to seek their identities through the group identity. Schultheis has put it better than I.

> We don't need any more special programs for disadvantaged youth. We need programs to help bilingual students develop greater skill in standard English. We need programs to help those with specific reading problems and we need programs to help those with specific arithmetic problems. It's time to stop labeling students and start teaching them.[11]

And again, returning to Professor Patterson's criticism of group identification:

> We do not relate to groups but to other individuals. It is not groups we love, or hate, or respect, or go to bed with. It is other individuals.[12]

REFERENCES

1. M.A. Nottingham and R. E. Ferris, "Performance Requirements, Not Carnegie Units, Are Best Measure of Learning," Walkabout, March, 1976, pp. 1-3.

2. American Council on Education, Framework for Evaluating Institutional Commitment to Minorities (Washington: American Council on Education, 1976), p. 10.

3. Junius A. Davis, et al., The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for "Disadvantaged" Students (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1975), p. 10-30.

4. Ibid., pp. 10-30 and 10-31.

5. Frank M. Vivio, The Development of Evaluation Procedures for Special Services Programs, (East Lansing: Office of Special Programs, Michigan State University), pp. 46-51.

6. Ibid., p. 31.

7. Deborah K. Daniels, ed., Education by, for, and about African Americans: A Profile of Several Black Community Schools (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Printing and Duplicating Service) p. xiv.

8. John B. Bergeson and George S. Miller, eds., Learning Activities for Disadvantaged Children, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), pp. 607.

9. Ibid., p. 8.

10. Orlando Patterson, Ethnicity and the Pluralist Fallacy, "Change, March, 1975, p. 11. Also see "Ethnicity and Cultural Pluralism," Change, Summer, 1975, pp. 4-7 and pp. 70-72.

11. Robert A. Schultheis, "Time to Stop Labeling and Start Teaching," The Education Digest, January, 1976, p. 28.

12. Patterson, op. cit., p. 11.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAMES	INSTITUTIONS
Jerry Ayscue Leland Cooper Tom Cottingham Jack Dillard Emily Gloster Mike Johnson Mike Shaefer Bill Smith Rod Smith John Thompson Vanessa Veale Eduardo Zambrana	Appalachian State University
Tony Deal Beverly Hawkins Charley McAffee Wanda Sigmon	Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute
Dan Ballard	Catawba Valley Technical Institute
Harley Affeldt Paul Apple Grace Corey Marilyn Stowers	Forsyth Technical Institute
Phyllis Hart Darlene Hodges Walter James James R. Moody	Haywood Technical Institute
Robert Conley David Daniel Stover Dunagan John Karriker Jeannie Petillo James Turner	Isothermal Community College
John Keen Kearny Smith	Mayland Technical Institute
Larry Brown	McDowell Technical Institute
Baxter Allen Jim Campbell Leroy Foster Sibyl Reed	Southwestern Technical Institute
Carlos Surratt	Surry Community College

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
(Continued)

NAMES	INSTITUTIONS
Carl Moore	Tri-County Technical Institute
Lawrence Arney	Western Carolina University
Lawrence Bixby	
Raymond Ledford	
Clifford Lovin	
Joe Meigs	
Gordon Blank	Western Piedmont Community College
Terry Burkert	
Jack Case	
George Fouts	
Joanne Johnston	
Winston Lear	
Bev McClure	
H. D. Moretz	
Diann Nate	
Harold Olsen	
Jim Reed	
Mary Jane Simmons	
Dan Southern Ruth Thomas	
Carol West	
Larry Whitlock	
Bonnie Bauguss	Wilkes Community College
Howard Blackburn	
Fay Byrd	
Donalee Davis	
Coot Gilreath	
Bob Goforth	
Jo Hendrix	
Bob Johnston	
Phillip Lewis	
Roger McElvery	
Marlene McNeil	
Jean Miles	
Cheryl Reid	
William Richardson	
Nancy Vandett	

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
(Continued)

CONSULTANTS

John W. Lavery, President
John Tyler Community College
Chester, Virginia

Revonda Williams
Assistant to the President
Mountain Empire Community College
Big Stone Gap, Virginia

Janice Kennedy
Assistant to the President
Bishop State Community College
Mobile, Alabama

Charles E. Grigsby
Mathematics Department Coordinator
Southeastern Community College
Whiteville, North Carolina

RESOURCE PERSONS

North Carolina State Department
of Community Colleges

James Ellerbe
James Hamlet
Hazel Small
Tommy Williams

Southern Regional Education Board

Samuel E. Cary

HOST INSTITUTION: Western Piedmont Community College
Morganton, North Carolina

Dr. Gordon C. Blank, President

SPONSOR: Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity
Southern Regional Education Board

WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA CONSORTIUM, INC.

Member Institutions

Appalachian State University
Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute
Blue Ridge Technical Institute
Caldwell Community College & Technical Institute
Catawba Valley Technical Institute
Forsyth Technical Institute
Haywood Technical Institute
Isothermal Community College
Mayland Technical Institute
Southwestern Community College
Surry Community College
Tri-County Technical Institute
Western Carolina University
Western Piedmont Community College
Wilkes Community College
North Carolina Department of Community Colleges

CONSORTIUM STAFF DEVELOPMENT TASK GROUP

Dr. William R. Richardson	Chairman
Dr. Leland Cooper	Appalachian State University
Mr. Richard Croom	Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute
Mr. Bob Hill	Blue Ridge Technical Institute
Ms. Beverly Hawkins	Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute
Mr. Kenneth Garrett	Catawba Valley Technical Institute
Mr. Paul Apple	Forsyth Technical Institute
Ms. Darlene Hodges	Haywood Technical Institute
Mr. James Turner	Isothermal Community College
Mr. John Keen	Mayland Technical Institute
Ms. Marty Shields	McDowell Technical Institute
Ms. Sybil Reed	Southwestern Technical Institute
Mr. Carlos Surratt	Surry Community College
Mr. Carl Moore	Tri-County Technical Institute
Dr. Lawrence Arney	Western Carolina University
Ms. Joanne Johnston	Western Piedmont Community College
Dr. Phillip Lewis	Wilkes Community College
Dr. Hazel Small	Department of Community Colleges

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The effectiveness and success of the workshop was achieved because of the intense enthusiasm and concern of the participants who surely found the setting and the convenience of accommodations conducive to a profitable experience.

We therefore express deep appreciation to Dr. Gordon Blank, president of the host institution, and to the faculty and staff who provided every accommodation needed to make the workshop a success. We realize the transfer of class meetings and the adjustment of the daily schedules imposed greatly upon those not associated with the workshop but who performed the additional responsibilities in the most professional manner.

Of no less importance has been the work of the workshop planning committee chaired by Dr. William R. Richardson and very ably assisted by Dr. Hazel Small of the North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges, Ms. Sybil M. Reed, Ms. Darlene C. Hodges, Ms. Joanne S. Johnston and Ms. Beverly C. Hawkins.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 3 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES